## Case 1:10-cv-04976-FB-JO Document 35 Filed 12/22/11 Page 1 of 6 PageID #: 157

# LEASON ELLIS

December 22, 2011

Reference No.: 03511/606201-000

One Barker Avenue Fifth Floor White Plains, New York 10601-1526 T. 914.821.9077 F. 914.288.0023

Paul Fields
Of Counsel
Fields@LeasonEllis.com

### VIA ECF & COURIER

Hon. Frederic Block United States District Judge Eastern District of New York United States Courthouse 225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, NY 11201

Re

Vaad L'Hafotzas Sichos, Inc. v. Kehot Publication Society, et al.

Civil Action No. 10-CV-4976 (FB)(JO)

Dear Judge Block:

It has come to my attention that you received a copy of Defendant Merkos counsel's procedurally infirm letter motion to Judge Mauskopf in an unrelated action that incorrectly asserted that a new action filed two weeks ago was related to the instant action. For your Honor's edification, attached is a copy of the opposition that Plaintiffs' counsel filed in that case along with a copy of the Complaint.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Fields .

PF/CSR

## Case 1:10-cv-04976-FBTD EDDCMNON Filed 12422411 Page 2 of 6 PageID #: 158

# MITCHELL C. SHAPIRO

15 Cutter Mill Road #207 Great Neck, New York 11021 (tel) 516-570-2773 (fax) 516-706-5075 (email) mcs@mcshapirolaw.com

BY HAND

December 19, 2011

Hon. Roslynn R. Mauskopf United States District Judge Eastern District of New York U.S. Courthouse 225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201

Re: Vaad L'Hafotzas Sichos, Inc. et al. v. Krinsky et al. (1:11-cv-05658-RRM-MDG)

Dear Judge Mauskopf:

I am lead trial counsel for the Plaintiffs in the above-referenced matter, and I write in response to a letter submitted by Christopher Jensen, Esq., purportedly on behalf of all defendants and dated December 15, 2011. Plaintiffs respectfully submit that the Court should deny the defendants' request as moot since, as admitted in counsel's letter application, I already granted the extension sought by defendants. Attached is a copy of the email correspondence between the parties and a copy of the fully-executed stipulation extending defendants' time to answer through January 13, 2012.

The Court should disregard counsel's inaccurate mischaracterization of this case as being "a related action" to another case currently pending before Judge Block. If this case was in fact a "related action," plaintiffs would have so indicated on the civil cover sheet and likely would have used the same law firm to prosecute the action, which they did not. The other pending case involves plaintiffs' challenge to one defendant's ownership and use of a trademark that was the subject of a TTAB proceeding, and which is used on all publications ever approved by the Rebbe, indicating that the publication is an approved Chabad publication. This case, on the other hand, involves (i) 13 other defendants, (ii) defendants' violation of plaintiffs' registered copyrights over a few works, irrespective of any trademarks, (iii) business tort claims for millions of dollars in damages from defendants, including claims that individual defendants unjustly enriched themselves, (iv) claims that defendants have violated a prior federal court order and rulings of rabbinical courts, and (v) claims on behalf of the entire Lubavitcher-Chasidic community that challenge to the authority of the individual defendants to control the business activities of the corporate defendants and to frustrate the Chabad community's rights to benefit from the use of the priceless "Lubavitcher Library", in direct violation of a prior ruling of Judge Sifton that was affirmed by the Second Circuit. Some of the parties may be the same, but the issues and cases are vastly different. The facts that the defendants have yet to retain Mr. Jensen's firm in this action, and that they would even need an extension of time to answer the Complaint herein (when discovery has already ended in the other case and summary judgment motions have been submitted), is further indicatation that the two cases are not "related actions." Even if defendants had retained counsel in this case and had made a proper motion for consolidation or reassignment under Rule 50.3.1(d) and (e), the standards of Rule 50.3.1(a) would not have been met.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell C. Shapiro

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
VAAD L'HAFOTZAS SICHOS, INC., et al.	Civil Action No. 11 Civ. 5658
Plaintiffs,	(RRM)(MDG)
-against-	STIPULATION
CHAIM YEHUDAH KRINSKY, et al.	
Defendants.	X
IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the undersigned counsel that	
defendants' time to answer or otherwise move with respect to the Complaint herein is extended	
to and including January 13, 2011.	
Dated: New York, New York December 7, 2011	
	COWAN LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P.C.
	By:  J. Christopher Jensen (jcj@cll.com)  1133 Avenue of the Americas  New York, New York 10036  (212)790-9200
	LAW OFFICES OF MITCHELL C. SHADIRO  By: Mitchell C. Shapiro, Esq. 15 Cutter Mill Road #207 Great Neck, New York 11021 (516) 570-2773

(mcs@mcshapirolaw.com)

#### Mitchell C. Shapiro

From: Mitch

Mitchell C. Shapiro, Esq. [mcs@mcshapirolaw.com]

Sent: Sunday, December 18, 2011 5:59 PM

To: 'Jensen, Christopher'

Subject: RE: Extension of Time to Answer

Attachments: fully executed stipulation extending time.pdf

Copy of fully executed stipulation attached.

Mitchell C. Shapiro, Esq.

LAW OFFICES OF MITCHELL C. SHAPIRO Main Office 245 West 17th Street, 5th Floor

New York, New York 10011

Mailing Address: 15 Cutter Mill Road, #207

Great Neck, New York 11021

(tel) 516.570.2773 (fax) 516.829.1555

(e-mail) mcs@mcshapirolaw.com (web) www.mcshapirolaw.com

(web) www.linkedin.com/in/mitchelleshapiro

The Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, covers this electronic mail message. The information transmitted by this e-mail is intended only for the addressee and may contain confidential and / or privileged material. Any interception, review, retransmission, dissemination, or other use of, or taking of any action upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited by law and may subject them to criminal or civil liability. If you received this communication in error, please contact me immediately (by return email, by phone at 516.570.2773 or by fax at 516.829.1555), and delete the communication from any computer or network system.

From: Jensen, Christopher [mailto:JC]@cll.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2011 9:40 AM

To: 'mcs@mcshapirolaw.com'

Subject: RE: Extension of Time to Answer

We have not received an executed copy of the stipulation. Can you please email me an executed copy so that I may file it with the Court. Thank you.

J. Christopher Jensen

Cowan, Liebowitz & Latman, P.C.

1133 Avenue of the Americas

New York, N.Y. 10036-6799

(212) 790-9204

**From:** Mitchell C. Shapiro [mailto:mcs@mcshapirolaw.com]

Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 4:44 PM

To: Jensen, Christopher

Subject: Re: Extension of Time to Answer

We will consent. Executed stip to follow.

Mitchell C. Shapiro (tel) 516-570-2773

(fax) 516-706-5075

(email) mcs@mcshapirolaw.com

(web) www.linkedin.com/in/mitchellcshapiro

From: "Jensen, Christopher" < ICJ@cll.com>

Date: Wed, 7 Dec 2011 16:07:32 -0500

To: 'mcs@mcshapirolaw.com'<mcs@mcshapirolaw.com>

Subject: Extension of Time to Answer

I have confirmed with all of the defendants that they will waive any objection to service of process or personal jurisdiction if you agree to extend their time to respond to the complaint until January 13, 2011. I have taken the liberty of preparing a stipulation extending the time to answer. I am attaching an executed copy of the stipulation. If your client consents, please execute the stipulation and email it to me so that I can file the stipulation via ECF. If your client does not consent, please let me know as soon as possible so that I can request an extension from the court.

J. Christopher Jensen Cowan, Liebowitz & Latman, P.C. 1133 Avenue of the Americas New York, N.Y. 10036-6799 (212) 790-9204

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### IRS CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE

Under regulations issued by the U.S. Treasury, to the extent that tax advice is contained in this communication (or any attachment or enclosure hereto), you are advised that such tax advice is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used by you, or any other party to whom this correspondence is shown, for the purpose of: (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code, or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending the tax advice addressed herein to any other party.

This message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### IRS CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE

Under regulations issued by the U.S. Treasury, to the extent that tax advice is contained in this communication (or any attachment or enclosure hereto), you are advised that such tax advice is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used by you, or any other party to whom this correspondence is shown, for the purpose of: (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code, or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending the tax advice addressed herein to any other party.

This message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality

## Case 1:10-cv-04976-FB-JO Document 35 Filed 12/22/11 Page 6 of 6 PageID #: 162

protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you.